

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are presently pending in this case. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 16-18 are amended and new Claims 19 and 20 are added by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 16-18 and new Claims 19 and 20 are supported by the original disclosure,¹ no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 2 was objected to; Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Patent No. 7,299,271) in view of Kyojima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,936, herein “Kyojima”); and Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sato in view of Kyojima and Dansie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,308,487, herein “Dansie”).

With respect to the objection of Claim 2, Claim 2 is amended to remove the noted informality. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the objection of Claim 2 be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, and 18 as unpatentable over Sato in view of Kyojima, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

sending file request information that requests an acquire/use file storing acquire/use content identification information and content attribute information, to an acquire/use information providing device in response to a request for content data;

receiving via a proxy device said acquire/use file that stores the content identification information and said attribute information of said content data sent by said acquire/use information providing device in response to the content data request, ***said content identification information and content attribute information are stored in a data area such that no information is removed when the acquire/use file passes through said proxy device, said receiving via a proxy device including receiving said acquire/use file sent in compliance***

¹See, e.g., the specification at paragraphs 96 and 97 of the publication.

with HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol) from said acquire/use information providing device;

sending content request information requesting said content data from a content providing device according to said acquire/use information contained in said acquire/use file; and
receiving said content data sent by said content providing device in response to the transmission of said content request information.

As described in the enclosed copy of the HTTP standard, §4.4 describes that “If a Content-Length header field (section 14.13) is present, its decimal value in OCTETs represents both the entity-length and the transfer-length. The Content-Length header field MUST NOT be sent if these two lengths are different (i.e., if a Transfer-Encoding header field is present). If a message is received with both a Transfer-Encoding header field and a Content-Length header field, the latter MUST be ignored.” (Emphasis original.) Thus, under the HTTP standard, a proxy device ***always*** removes some information from a message meeting the above description. Accordingly, the device described by Sato, which describes the use of the HTTP standard, must also have this property as described in the standard. Accordingly, not only does Sato not teach or suggest “said content identification information and content attribute information are stored in a data area such that no information is removed when the acquire/use file passes through said proxy device, said receiving via a proxy device including receiving said acquire/use file sent in compliance with HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol) from said acquire/use information providing device,” modifying Sato to include this feature would make Sato unsuitable for its intended purpose, which is providing HTTP compliant communication.

Further, Kyojima only describes the storage of data that a user cannot change, and does not describe anything related to communications according to the HTTP standard. Accordingly, Kyojima also does not teach or suggest “said content identification information and content attribute information are stored in a data area such that no information is removed when the acquire/use file passes through said proxy device, said receiving via a

proxy device including receiving said acquire/use file sent in compliance with HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol) from said acquire/use information providing device.”

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination does not teach or suggest “receiving via a proxy device” as defined in amended Claim 1, and there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Sato to include the above highlighted features. Consequently, Claim 1 (and Claims 2-5, 19, and 20 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Sato in view of Kyojima.

Independent Claims 6, 9, 14, 17, and 18 also recite the use of the HTTP standard where information is stored in a data area such that no information is removed when a file passes through a proxy device. As noted above, under the HTTP standard, a proxy device *always* removes some information from a message meeting the above description. Accordingly, independent Claims 6, 9, 14, 17, and 18 (and Claims 7, 8, 10-13, 15, and 16 dependent therefrom) are patentable over Sato in view of Kyojima for the reasons described above with respect Claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 4 and 12 as unpatentable over Sato in view of Kyojima and Dansie, it is noted that Claims 4 and 12 are dependent from Claims 1 and 9, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Dansie does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Sato and Kyojima. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 4 and 12 are patentable over Sato in view of Kyojima and Dansie.

New Claims 19 and 20 are supported at least by the specification at paragraphs 96 and 97 of the publication. New Claims 19 and 20 are dependent on Claim 1, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 19 and 20 are also patentable over the proposed combination.


Application No. 10/564,414
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2008

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bradley D. Lytle", is written over a horizontal line.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998

I:\ATTY\ET\283098US\283098US-AMD3.21.09.DOC